

Date: Fri, 4 Mar 94 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #96
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 4 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 96

Today's Topics:

Have a say about ARRL policy
HELP W/2 METER BAND PLAN
Morse Whiners
rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 03 Mar 94 09:34:25 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!
wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Have a say about ARRL policy
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

hlester@helium.gas.uug.arizona.edu (howard n lester) writes:

> In article <1994Feb28.230819.12135@arrl.org>,
> Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:
> >You can also usually find your Division Director at most major hamfests
>
> How much do they usually sell for?
>
> :)
>
Do you really want us to tell you what they are WORTH?

: -)

--

"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,
The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: 28 Feb 94 05:43:03 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: HELP W/2 METER BAND PLAN
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

James W. Jones (jjones@bigcat.missouri.edu) wrote:

: Will someone please share with me the arrangement of the 2 meter band?
: What I need the most is the portion of the band that is reserved for
: simplex operation. I fear just selecting a random frequency to use as
: a simplex channel as it may be part or a repeater pair. Part of the
: band is reserved for simplex but I am not sure as to which part.
: Appreciate any help on this.
: Jim Jones K5GSH
: jjones@bigcat.missouri.edu

You might start with these frequencies for fm simplex in the 2meter band:

146.415
146.430
146.445
146.460
146.475
146.490
146.505
146.520 nationwide fm simplex calling frequency
146.535
146.550
146.565
146.580 may have packet
146.595

147.405
147.420
147.435
147.450

147.465
147.480
147.495
147.510
147.525
147.540
147.555
147.570
147.585

These frequencies generally are used for simplex ... but local conditions and milage may vary. Almost any night of the week you will hear nets operating on one or more of these frequencies.

Bob n6fri

--
Bob Wilkins bwilkins@cave.org

Date: Thu, 03 Mar 94 09:54:39 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!
caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

`jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu` (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <1994Feb28.232131.12347@arrl.org>,
> Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:
> >I love the sense of kinship that we all feel for each other, just
> >because we are hams. We will survive code, or no code. I don't
> >know if we will survive the division. Somehow, we will ultimately
> >decide the fate of Morse code, as a community and as a Service.
> >The way we go about that will shape our hobby more than the final
> >outcome.
>
> Ed, that's just it: I think that to completely eliminate the code will destroy
> the amateur radio service. Period.
>
> Why do I think this? I need look no farther than the local two meter boxes,
> which are now completely overrun with refugees from Channel 19. The quality of
> the service has declined in the years since the no-code Tech was introduced.
>
> I'd be willing to put up with that if the promises of no-code advocates that
> we'd see an influx of technical geniuses who would restore the service to its

> glory days of technological innovation had been borne out. Instead, I have ye
> to see a single technical innovation attributable to someone who has joined
> the service purely because of the availability of the no-code Tech. Even the
> most rabid of anti-code advocates have yet to be able to cite an instance.

I have yet to hear ONE advance of coded hams in the last 20 years, not
the 3 that the no-code license has been here. (The 1200 baud packet info
super-dirt-road does not count as an inovation.)

> People get nasty when things they hold dear are threatened. I'm not at all
> surprised that the continuing no-code advocacy is producing heated reactions,
> for they are doing exactly that.
>
> The no-code license is the Brady Act of ham radio: it's the camel's nose in
> the tent of destroying the fundamentals of the service. Like the Brady Act, i
> should be thrown out on its ear.

Comparing the no-code license to the Brady Law is absurd in the extream.

--
"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,
The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: Thu, 03 Mar 94 09:33:27 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!math.ohio-
state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

> Dan Pickersgill <dan@mystis.wariat.org> writes:
>
> >> Clearly wrong? How so. I did it, and thousands before me did it. Are you
> >> saying that just because it requires effort, it shouldn't be an element?
> >> Sounds like an appeal to laziness to me.

Ed, please watch your quotes, I did not say the above. Thanks. 73,

>
> It is clearly wrong to require Morse knowledge for the use of other modes
> because that knowledge does NOT contribute to more effective use of those

> modes. THAT is my argument against the Morse test -- not that "I can't do it
> not that "it isn't fair!," but that it simply is not RELEVANT knowledge (since
> it is needed for only ONE of many possible modes) and therefore should not be
> required.
>
> "I did it, and thousands before me did it" isn't a valid reason for keeping the
> element; it says nothing about the need or desirability of such testing.

--
"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,
The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: 28 Feb 94 10:48:19 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!
sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>, <2krktk\$g6e@sugar.neosoft.com>,
<2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>,
Bill Blum N9VLS <n9vls@MCS.COM> wrote:
>In article <2krktk\$g6e@sugar.neosoft.com>,
>A great x ray technician! <xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:
>>In article <2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>,
>>Bill Blum N9VLS <n9vls@MCS.COM> wrote:
>>
>>>Where are we going? Planet 10! When are we going? Real Soon!
>>
>>Buckeroo Banzai!!!
>
>shhhhhhhh.
>I'm cutting phasing cables for a DF antenna. You're bothering me.

DFing stations on the USENET doesn't work too well. And, of course,
I elect NOT to use Two Meters. Hummm...

--
"Meeting him, shaking his hand--it was overwhelming. It was better than sex.
Of course, I haven't had sex before, but I'm sure this was better."

--A Codeless Technician, after meeting Dan Pickersgill for the first time.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #96
